
A REVIEW

OF PRESIDENT WILSON'S ADMINISTRATION BY HANNIS TAYLOR, A LIFE-LONG DEMOCRAT, WHO ASSAILS MR. WILSON AS AN EXTREME FEDERALIST; AS A DEFAMER OF JEFFERSON; AS AN ABNORMALLY AMBITIOUS AND DANGEROUS REVOLUTIONIST WITH MONARCHICAL TENDENCIES, WHO IS STRIVING TO BUILD UP IN THIS COUNTRY, IN HIS OWN SELFISH INTEREST, A POLITICAL DICTATORSHIP ENTIRELY UNFETTERED BY ALL "PROMISES AND COVENANTS" MADE BY HIM IN PARTY PLATFORMS.

Cicero said: "The foundation of justice is good faith; that is to say, a true and unswerving adherence to promises and covenants."

Junius said: "As for Mr. Wedderburn (Lord Loughborough) there is something about him even treachery cannot trust."

An old English chronicler, in speaking of King John, said: "He is a King whom no oaths can bind."

by transfer

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY SUPERSEDED BY A POLITICAL DICTATORSHIP	1
THE NEW TYRANNY	2
MR. WILSON'S CONFESSION OF POLITICAL FAITH, IN WHICH HE CALLS THE PRESIDENCY "THE REAL THRONE OF ADMINISTRATION"	3
MR. WILSON'S LIBEL ON THE CHARACTER OF JEFFERSON .	5
MR. WILSON'S REVIVAL OF "THE KING'S SPEECH," AND HIS MARKED AVERSION TO PERSONAL CONTACT WITH THE PEOPLE	6
"COURT FAVORITES" INTRODUCED BY MR. WILSON INTO AMERICAN POLITICS	7
MR. WILSON'S FLAGRANT BREACH OF HIS SOLEMN COVE- NANT NOT TO BE A CANDIDATE TO SUCCEED HIMSELF .	10
MR. WILSON'S UNFAITHFUL CONDUCT A WARNING TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO LIMIT THE PRESIDENT TO A SINGLE TERM	14
MR. WILSON'S UTTER FAILURE TO UPHOLD OUR DIGNITY AS THE GREATEST OF THE NEUTRAL NATIONS . .	18
THE MEXICAN HORROR	21
PRESIDENT CLEVELAND AND PRESIDENT WILSON CON- TRASTED	23
MR. CLEVELAND'S ESTIMATE OF MR. WILSON . . .	25
THE THINGS MR. WILSON STANDS FOR	26



WASHINGTON, D. C.,
September 5, 1916.

U. S. G. 112720
TO THE NATIONAL BUSINESS MEN'S
REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE,
New York City.

GENTLEMEN:

I have received your letters in which you say: "May we have your name, endorsement, and moral support on committee for the election of Charles E. Hughes for President? * * * We should be very glad indeed to have you make your statement through this committee at the right time." Knowing Mr. Hughes to be a wise and progressive statesman, an exceptionally able jurist, a man of affairs, a fearless patriot with the courage of his conviction, I cannot doubt his ability to deal successfully with the mighty problems with which the world in general and our country in particular are now confronted. At this critical moment in our history, with the war drums beating in every quarter, certainly it will be a blessing to the country for the administration of a drifting and irresolute opportunist to be succeeded by that of a resolute statesman with positive convictions, whose firmness and moral dignity will be the best security for peace. But, admitting all that to be true, have I, a life-long Democrat who never voted a Republican ticket nor supported a Republican candidate, the right to support Mr. Hughes?

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY SUPERSEDED BY A POLITICAL
DICTATORSHIP.

I was invited to preside and did preside over a great political meeting held at Washington to ratify the first nomination of Mr. Wilson; I subscribed to his campaign fund; I gave him my cordial support in every way. In the only personal letter I ever addressed to him I told him I had nothing whatever to ask of him, a promise to which I have faithfully adhered. Living as I do at the

seat of Government, with a large personal acquaintance with the leaders of both political parties, I have had exceptional opportunities to study at close range every act of Mr. Wilson's administration, foreign and domestic. I have watched all the currents and counter-currents that have influenced that incoherent mass of inconsistent acts which he is pleased to call his policy. Thus, against my will and political associations, I have been forced to conclude that no man who ever filled the Presidential office was so opposed to the basic principles for which the Democratic party stands as Mr. Wilson; that he is at heart a typical and extreme Federalist, intent upon the abnormal exaltation of the powers of the Executive and the humiliation of Congress. To use an epithet he once employed in stigmatizing Jefferson, Mr. Wilson is "a philosophical radical," intent upon transforming the Presidency of the United States into a Political Dictatorship with himself as its head.

THE NEW TYRANNY.

I have seen Mr. Wilson trample under foot, apparently without remorse, the party platform upon which he was elected, and which he pledged his sacred honor to the people faithfully to carry out. I was near at hand when he drafted a second party platform which he sent to St. Louis from the White House by one of his agents, with an imperious demand that it be accepted by the Convention as its act and deed. If he should be re-elected he will claim of course the right to repudiate, in whole or in part, that second party platform, which is, in a very peculiar sense, the work of his own hands. Thus the old Democratic party to which I have belonged all my life, and which has heretofore expressed its corporate will through representatives chosen from its ranks, has been for the moment abolished or at least superseded by a Political

Dictatorship, created by an arrogant usurper, who has demonstrated his utter inability to play the pretentious role he has prepared for himself. I cannot, without a sacrifice of my self-respect, consent to support this new and pre-eminently undemocratic system of political tyranny which would be a real menace to the country and the Constitution, were it not for the feebleness and inefficiency of its creator. The only thing that has ever justified dictatorships in the past has been the pre-eminent ability and authority, in moments of supreme peril, of the dictator himself, qualities whose conspicuous absence has rendered Mr. Wilson's unprecedented performances really grotesque. If our Democratic system of Government is to be overthrown, let it be done by a masterful man, not by one so timid, so silly as to compromise us in the eyes of the whole world by the false and ridiculous assertion that we are "too proud to fight."

MR. WILSON'S CONFESSION OF POLITICAL FAITH, IN WHICH HE CALLS THE PRESIDENCY "THE REAL THRONE OF ADMINISTRATION."

Mr. Wilson's bitterest enemy will not dare to assert that, in his efforts to exalt abnormally the powers of the Presidency and to humiliate Congress, he is at all inconsistent or unfaithful to the political creed which he proclaimed at the beginning of his career as a public man. In his well-known work entitled "*Congressional Government*," 5th ed., his thesis is that the Presidency was in an ideal state under the Federalist party, when Congress was opened with the spectacle of a cavalcade and Presidential oration ("a King's Speech" of which he is so fond), followed by legislative responses and precessions in imitation of the ancient pageantry of the British Crown conducted by the gentleman usher of the Black Rod at Westminster. In those good old days Mr. Wilson says: "He

[the President] was constituted one of the three great co-ordinate branches of the Government; his functions were made of the highest dignity; his privileges many and substantial * * * and there can be little doubt that, had the presidential chair always been filled by men of commanding character, of acknowledged ability and of thorough political training, it would have continued to be a seat of the highest authority and consideration, *the true center of the Federal structure, THE REAL THRONE OF ADMINISTRATION, and the frequent source of politics*" (p. 41). But, according to Mr. Wilson's view, the evil days came with the development and assertion of the power of the people as vested in Congress—to use his own words, the "prestige" of the Presidency was "belittled by growth of Congressional power" (p. 341). Again to use his own words: "*That high office [the Presidency] has fallen from its first estate of dignity because its power has waned; and its power has waned because the power of Congress has become predominant*" (p. 43). Mr. Wilson's persistent and sincere purpose, since he was clothed by Democratic votes with the executive power, has been to put in force his Federalist theory of government as expounded in his first book, with "the King's Speech" in the center of the stage, and with Congress prostrate at the feet of the presidential office. Some faithful artist should give to the American people a graphic picture of our so-called Democratic President as he appears when, wrapped in the solitude of his monarchical tendencies, he delivers his "King's Speech," from "*the real throne of administration,*" to an awe-stricken Congress! It is this new condition of things which Mr. Wilson is now asking the American people to make permanent.

MR. WILSON'S LIBEL ON THE CHARACTER OF JEFFERSON.

As all the world knows, Jefferson assumed the Presidency firmly resolved to abolish, at once and forever, "the King's Speech" to Congress, with all the other monarchical flummery which Mr. Wilson so adores. Jefferson's now obsolete theory was that "the real throne of Administration" should be, not in the White House, but in Congress where the voice of the people could be heard. He therefore informed both houses in writing on December 8, 1801, that "the King's Speech" would henceforth be superseded by the Presidential Message, which continued, as a purely American institution, for more than a century until abolished by Mr. Wilson in favor of the monarchical usage of Federalist times. When his habitual bitterness towards all who oppose him or differ with him is taken into account, can we wonder at the cynical and contemptuous spirit in which he claims that Jefferson was merely a poseur, a deliberately insincere demagogue, an aristocrat masquerading in the garb of a leader of the common people? In his *History of the American People*, Vol. IV, pp. 3 and 4, Mr. Wilson says: "Mr. Jefferson, an aristocrat and yet a philosophical radical, deliberately practised the arts of the politician and exhibited oftentimes the sort of insincerity which subtle natures yield to without loss of essential integrity. *General Jackson was incapable of arts or deceptions of any kind.* He was, in fact, what his partisans loved to call him, a man of the people, of the common people. *Mr. Jefferson was only a patron of the people:* appealed to the rank and file, believed in them, but shared neither their tastes nor their passions." There is a crystal lake in the high Sierras so fathomless that it reflects only the image of the traveler who looks into its depths. And so, when the autocrat, with monarchical tendencies, who now misrepresents the party Jefferson founded, looks into that fathomless mind he can not comprehend, he sees only

his own image, which he has unconsciously painted. What Mr. Wilson has said so viciously and so unnecessarily of the dead Jefferson, whose shoes he is now attempting to fill, is simply a precious bit of self-revelation. The "aristocrat," the "philosophical radical," who "deliberately practices the arts of the politician" is now the President of the United States, seeking re-election in defiance of his solemn pledge not to be a candidate to succeed himself.

MR. WILSON'S REVIVAL OF "THE KING'S SPEECH," AND HIS MARKED AVERSION TO PERSONAL CONTACT WITH THE PEOPLE.

If specific proof is demanded of that assertion, it is to be found in Mr. Wilson's sudden and arbitrary abolition of the Inaugural Ball and of the New Year's receptions which, since the foundation of the Government, have been the sacramental ties binding the Presidency to the rank and file of the people. Even the cold and exclusive Adamses were willing to mingle with the people at inaugural balls and New Year's receptions. But Mr. Wilson cannot go that far. He has become so proud, so pretentious, so monarchical in his habits of life, that he considers it necessary, even in the summer season, to set up "the real throne of administration" in the great palace of Shadow Lawn, the vulgar and ostentatious creation of a multi-millionaire.

Since Mr. Wilson's abrupt and ruthless abolition of the Inaugural Ball and New Year's receptions—institutions as old as the Government itself—the uninvited masses of the people have been deprived of the privilege of approaching, on such occasions, "the real throne of administration." Those who enter the White House, when entertainments are given, must be specially invited by a gilded and embossed card, delivered, not through the mails, but by Presidential messengers. And even when

the President delivers "the King's Speech" in the hall of the House of Representatives, the general public is severely excluded. No one can go even to the galleries without a special card of admission. We may confidently expect that, after the inauguration of the new President on the 4th of March next, he will announce at once, as Jefferson did, the abolition of "the King's Speech," with all the monarchical flummery attending it; and the revival of the Inaugural Ball and New Year's receptions, which had become cherished parts of our national life.

"COURT FAVORITES" INTRODUCED BY MR. WILSON INTO AMERICAN POLITICS.

After the abolition of the two Democratic institutions just mentioned, Mr. Wilson resolved to fill the vacuum not only by the revival of "the King's Speech" but by the introduction into American politics of "Court Favorites," an institution imported into England from Scotland by James I, a monarch often spoken of as the intellectual and political progenitor of the dictator under whom we now live. Following in the path of his great progenitor, Mr. Wilson drove from his cabinet, at a time when they were most needed by the country, the two dominating minds that refused to bow to his insolent and self-seeking dictatorship. Thus the way was cleared for the completion of that system of political absolutism under which our Government is now carried on by a group of obscure and inefficient individuals—Mr. Wilson's personal creations, "dependent ministers," who are "mere agents of the King's will."

At the head of "the Court Favorites" thus introduced by Mr. Wilson into American politics stands his Duke of Buckingham, Colonel Edward Makepeace House, connected only through his middle name with the august office of Ambassador of Ambassadors, with which he could

not possibly have been associated through even the remotest knowledge of diplomacy or international law. We know that Carr and Villiers were elevated to supreme power by James I by reason of their personal beauty, but, as Colonel House does not seem to possess that quality, the source of the unbounded influence of this obscure and untrained person over the President of the United States is a sealed mystery which it seems must remain forever unbroken. At a critical time in our diplomatic history, when an unselfish, patriotic and unfettered President would have summoned Mr. Olney, Mr. Choate, Mr. John Bassett Moore, Senator O'Gorman, or Senator Hoke Smith, Mr. Wilson turned to an obscure personal favorite, unknown to the people and never trusted by them, who is about as well adapted to the delicate functions of high diplomacy as a cobbler to the work of a mathematical astronomer. No great office is ever filled in the cabinet, on the bench, or elsewhere, without loud suggestions of the dominating influence of Colonel House; and when the office of Secretary of State was made vacant by the resignation of Mr. Bryan, the newspapers heralded the fact, never denied from the White House, that it was entirely at the Colonel's disposal if he would deign to accept it. Mr. Wilson is so obsessed by the "Court Favorite" idea, that he does not seem to understand that the great offices of state are not his personal perquisites to be bestowed upon obscure and incompetent individuals, entirely unconnected with our public life, simply because it suits his personal interest and convenience so to bestow them, *but the property of the people held only in trust by him for their benefit.*

Mr. Hughes has done well in denouncing in his campaign speeches the indefensible selfishness which has prompted Mr. Wilson to fill very many of the highest offices in the Government, at home and abroad, with fameless and incompetent persons, to many of whom he

is obligated by reason of political services of a journalistic character. All the world knows that, at the most critical moment in our diplomatic history, our diplomatic service has been weighted down, with a few exceptions, by such inexperienced and obscure persons as were never before accredited to the great posts. If any one is sceptical on that subject, let him but turn his eyes to the capitals of France and the British Empire, where the most critical diplomatic work is now being carried on. Mr. Wilson, who has thus dragged our diplomatic service down to a point never reached before, refused at the beginning of his administration to give either aid or comfort to a bill carefully devised for its improvement, and introduced in the House by Mr. Henry of Texas, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, and in the Senate by Senator Bacon of Georgia, then Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. But Mr. Wilson's capital offense in the rewarding of personal retainers who served him in the public press is represented by his grossly unlawful elevation to the headship of the Government of the District of Columbia of a journalist with no possible connection with the District in the way of residence or property, in open defiance of a statute declaring that only an actual and *bona fide* resident of the District, a *home man*, shall be eligible to that office. *The question of Mr. Newman's eligibility has been tried by the courts and juries of the District, WHICH HAVE EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION OVER IT, and it has been solemnly adjudged by those tribunals that he be ousted from his office on account of his lack of legal capacity to hold it.* And yet, in open defiance of such judgments and verdict, Mr. Newman has been kept in office by Mr. Wilson; and the people of the District of Columbia have been thus deprived by his act, *aided by a technical flaw in legal procedure*, of the only scrap of local self-government they possessed, simply because the President of the United States

owed a political debt to a political retainer. Surely the new President will not be slow in redressing this outrage, whose author seems to be devoid of all sense of legality.

**MR. WILSON'S FLAGRANT BREACH OF HIS SOLEMN COVENANT
NOT TO BE A CANDIDATE TO SUCCEED HIMSELF.**

Mr. Wilson enjoys the very unenviable distinction of being the first President ever accused, so far as I know, of breaking the solemn "promises and covenants" made with the people in the party platform upon which he sought and obtained their votes. Under our rigid and complex constitution *the honor system*, under which the people give their suffrages in exchange for the "*promises and covenants*" given by nominees in party platforms, is at once vital and fundamental. Senator Norris hit the nail on the head when he said in a speech delivered at Washington a few months ago: "*The greatest evil in American politics today is the dishonest nominee.*" The question of questions involved in the approaching election is this: *Is Mr. Wilson a dishonest nominee?* Despite the labored and sophistical efforts made by his partizans and apologists to obscure the real facts involved, they are too plain to be misunderstood. Unless it is legitimate to argue, as De Quincy did, that "murder is a fine art," it is unnecessary to say that, when a nomination is accepted under our American honor system, *the nominee pledges his sacred honor* to observe every part and clause of the party platform as completely as if he took an oath to that effect in a court of justice. Such has always been the distinct understanding of the American people since our honor system began. The plain facts in Mr. Wilson's case are these: The Democratic platform of 1912, to every clause of which he solemnly pledged himself, provided: "We favor a single Presidential term, and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making

the President of the United States ineligible for re-election, *and we pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle.*" If ever a man had the right to speak for another, Mr. Bryan, the political creator of Mr. Wilson, who took the nomination away from the Hon. Champ Clark in order to give it to him, had the right not only to speak for Mr. Wilson but to bind him by his words. As his accredited representative and spokesman, Mr. Bryan canvassed the country in his interest, making many speeches, in all of which he declared to the people what his [Mr. Wilson's] understanding was as to his candidacy for a second term. At a great meeting held at Indianapolis on October 17, 1912, Mr. Bryan said: "We present him [Mr. Wilson] not only qualified in every way, but we present him *pledged to a single term*, that he may be your President and spend no time dividing patronage in order to secure delegates; that he need spend no time in planning for re-election; that he may give you all his thought and all his heart and all his energy. I believe *that when a man is lifted by his countrymen to this pinnacle of power he ought to tear from his heart every thought of ambition and on his bended knees consecrate his term to his country's service. That is our ideal President, and we present to you a man who measures up to that ideal.*" I was in Indianapolis at the time, and heard those words as they were spoken by Mr. Bryan to at least seven thousand people assembled in front of the State House. When that part of Mr. Bryan's speech, *pledging Mr. Wilson to a single term*, was republished in *Collier's* for November 6, 1915, I called his attention to it, and he said that he had seen it. So far from questioning the accuracy of the publication, he added that he had said the same thing in all his speeches everywhere. Will any honest man undertake to say that after Mr. Wilson permitted Mr. Bryan, *as his accredited representative and spokesman*, to canvas the

country and pledge him to a single term, *as his* [Mr. Wilson's] *construction of the Baltimore platform*, he was not as completely bound in honor as if he had made that pledge to the people in his own words? If that is not so, then the political morality of Machiavelli governs here; then the American honor system is at an end; then all such pledges as Mr. Bryan gave to the people as Mr. Wilson's representative are absolutely worthless. *Nobody has ever claimed that Mr. Wilson protested, at the time, that Mr. Bryan was not authorized to pledge him to a single term, as his* [Mr. Wilson's] *construction of the Baltimore platform.*

Painful and humiliating as the fact must be to every high-minded Democrat, it cannot be denied that, despite the solemn pledges made to the people by Mr. Bryan in his name, Mr. Wilson, *while President-elect*, set himself to work to find some loop-hole through which to escape from the double obligations by which he was bound hand and foot. A sensitive mind, fully conscious of the obligations of "promises and covenants," would have been appalled by the difficulties then in the way of such an undertaking. On June 4, 1912, Mr. Clayton, of Alabama, as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, had offered an amendment to the Constitution making the President ineligible for a second term. It was that pending amendment to which the Baltimore Convention that met on June 25th directly referred. Mr. Wilson was therefore bound by every principle of honor and of duty to insist that the then pending amendment, to which he was pledged, not only by the platform but by the solemn promises given to the people by Mr. Bryan in his name, should be made at once a part of the fundamental law. Under such circumstances what did he actually do? *Did he strive to secure the adoption of the Amendment, or did he deliberately and actively intrigue to defeat it?* Let the answer to that question come from his

able and experienced advocate and apologist, Mr. George Harvey, who, in attempting to make a case for him in *The North American Review* for February, 1916, made instead admissions that render all future attempts to defend him hopeless. Mr. Harvey said: "but after the election of Mr. Wilson upon a platform pledging the candidate to 'the principle' avowed, the proposition was revived in the Senate, and on February 1st, 1913, it was adopted by that body, seventeen anti-Roosevelt Republicans voting affirmatively and only one Democrat, Mr. Shively of Indiana, voting in the negative. The sentiment of the House was overwhelmingly in favor of the resolution, but the Democratic leaders, feeling that their newly elected President was entitled to consultation upon a matter of so much importance and having no late information respecting his attitude, DEFERRED ACTION UNTIL HIS VIEWS COULD BE ASCERTAINED * * * MEANWHILE THE PRESIDENT-ELECT INTERVENED IN THE LETTER TO MR. A. MITCHELL PALMER DATED FEBRUARY 13, WHICH WAS DULY EXHIBITED TO CHAIRMAN CLAYTON AND OTHER PROMINENT REPRESENTATIVES, WHO PROMPTLY BOWED TO THE WISH OF THEIR NEW LEADER AND BURIED THE RESOLUTION."

Thus, in by far the most studied and formal effort ever made to apologize for Mr. Wilson's wanton conduct in this regard, his advocate admits that the Amendment, to whose adoption he was so solemnly bound by a double pledge, after its adoption by the Senate, was defeated in the House, where the sentiment "was overwhelmingly in favor" of it, *by the active personal solicitation of Mr. Wilson, intriguing through a letter directed to Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, not as an individual but as Chairman of the Democratic caucus.* In describing that letter, *Collier's* for November 6, 1915, said: "Mr. Wilson dictated a long reply, about 1,500 words in length, and sent it to Representative A. Mitchell Palmer of Pennsylvania, then

Chairman of the Democratic caucus." Thus even Mr. Wilson's advocates and apologists are forced to admit that the machinery of the Democratic Party *was actively employed by him to defeat its and his solemn pledge to the people to limit the Presidency to a single term.*

MR. WILSON'S UNFAITHFUL CONDUCT A WARNING TO THE
AMERICAN PEOPLE TO LIMIT THE PRESIDENT TO A
SINGLE TERM.

Mr. Wilson has demonstrated by his conscienceless conduct, as described above, the lengths to which an abnormally ambitious and selfish man, lustful of power and office, may go in chasing the phantom of a second term. He trampled upon those things which most men hold most dear by actively intriguing to destroy the single term plank of the Baltimore Platform, through *the use of Democratic party machinery, even before his first term began.* How pathetic and humiliating it all is when we recall Mr. Bryan's golden words: "We present him [Mr. Wilson] not only qualified in every way, but we present him *pledged to a single term*, that he may be your President and spend no time dividing patronage in order to secure delegates; that he need spend no time in planning for re-election; that he may give you all his thought and all his heart and all his energy. *That is our ideal President, and we present to you a man who measures up to that ideal.*" Honest and noble-minded as he is, how sore at heart Mr. Bryan must be when he looks down on his fallen idol *who has done all the things he said he would not do.* The best work Mr. Bryan has ever done has been embodied in his efforts to protect his country against the terrible and growing evils of a second term. In the Indianapolis speech, in which he pledged Mr. Wilson to a single term, he said: "Eighteen years ago when I was a young man, a member of Congress, I introduced a resolution submitting an amendment limiting the President to a single

term in office. Three times when I was a candidate for office I announced immediately after my nomination that if I were elected I would not be a candidate for a second term." Mr. Wilson has manifested his ingratitude for all Mr. Bryan has done for him not only by forcing him out of his cabinet and becoming a candidate for a second term, *but by wrecking the cause for which Mr. Bryan has battled so long and so unselfishly. In Mr. Wilson's so-called St. Louis platform there is not a word about a second term.* Those who understand Mr. Bryan's character know perfectly well that he has a courage that can, when aroused, rise to the height of any occasion. The great moral and patriotic duty of his life is upon him now. He knows, as no other man knows, how wretched and faithless Mr. Wilson's conduct has been in violating his solemn pledge not to seek a second term. He therefore owes it to himself, to his reputation for consistency, to stand by the gospel he has preached so long and so forcefully. He owes it to the American people, he owes it to truth and justice, to rise in his high place in this Nation and, sinking partisanship in patriotism, denounce Mr. Wilson's candidacy *because he knows he is a "dishonest nominee."* *In the presence of Mr. Wilson's broken vows to the people, for whose performances he solemnly pledged himself as guarantor, how can Mr. Bryan support him for a second term?* M. Clemenceau certainly had Mr. Wilson in mind when, in defining a symbol, he said: "A man about whom the people still believe what was never true."

Is it possible that such a man as Mr. Wilson, who, to promote his inordinate and selfish ambition, has deliberately violated the solemn "promises and covenants" for whose performance he plighted his sacred honor to the American people, can, for a second time, be elevated by their votes to the chief magistracy of this Nation? That is now the question of questions, the issue of issues, which,

as it involves the moral dignity of the people of the United States, can neither be concealed nor ignored. Mr. Wilson's partisans within the Democratic party, who have been recreant in their duty to the ancient and historic organization which Jefferson founded, may shout as they will, but—

“Nor florid prose nor honeyed lines of rhyme,
Can blazon evil deeds, *or consecrate a crime.*”

No matter whether Mr. Bryan does his duty or not, the American people must and will do theirs'. For more than thirty years I have made a special study of our complex American Constitution; for the last fourteen years I have lived at Washington, where I have watched its practical workings, day by day, just as a machinist might watch the movements of a Corliss engine. In the light of that study and experience I do not hesitate to say that, in my humble judgment, the gravest defect in our National Constitution, that brings more evils to the people than all others combined, is represented by the lack of that amendment prohibiting a second term which Mr. Wilson's selfish ambition has for the moment defeated. His almost insane desire to succeed himself has deprived him of the power to be really useful at a critical moment in our history. His ceaseless pursuit of that will-o'-the-wisp called a second term has led him into all kinds of bogs and morasses; it has entangled him in hopeless inconsistencies; it has put him on both sides of nearly every public question; it has forced him to do things no other public man would have dared to do. The typical illustration of course is his sudden and violent change of front as to the exemption of American vessels from tolls in a canal built by American brains and American money through American territory. Representative Meeker of Missouri says Mr. Wilson is “the greatest President Great Britain ever had.” I have not a word to say now

as to the merits of the tolls question, as to which good and wise men have disagreed. It is not necessary to go farther than the statement that honesty and decency forbade Mr. Wilson's departure from the positive mandate on that subject of the Baltimore platform, *which he specially and earnestly advocated before the people in order to catch their votes*. Then, when the wind shifted, and it appeared as if more votes were to be had by facing the other way, he turned about with a ruthless cynicism that would have put Machiavelli to the blush, entirely ignoring that part of the Baltimore platform, repeated in speeches by him, which declares that "*Our pledges are made to be kept while in office, as well as to be relied upon during the campaign.*" He thus demonstrated that, like King John, he is also "a King whom no oaths can bind;" that he is a man whom "even treachery cannot trust." At one time Mr. Wilson gave us brilliant and conclusive reasons why the sending of arms and munitions into Mexico, which may be used against ourselves, was a wrong not to be tolerated. Then, when the wind shifted, he demonstrated in the same brilliant and conclusive way that such reasons have no real value at all. I wonder if he ever remembers, when engaged in these perilous acrobatic performances, which only a sublime and fatalistic vanity could inspire, the terms in which he denounced Jefferson, "an aristocrat and yet a philosophical radical," who, he says, "deliberately practised the arts of the politician, and yet exhibited oftentimes *the sort of insincerity which subtle natures yield to without the loss of essential integrity.*" Can the American people so stretch its mantle of Christian charity as to bring the "*subtle*" Mr. Wilson within his own saving clause? Can they force themselves to believe that he has been able to commit his graver offenses "without the loss of essential integrity"?

MR. WILSON'S UTTER FAILURE TO UPHOLD OUR DIGNITY AS
THE GREATEST OF THE NEUTRAL NATIONS.

Instead of offending all true Democrats by assailing the "essential integrity of Jefferson;" instead of abusing that genius and patriot as "an aristocrat," as a "philosophical radical," as "a patron of the people," Mr. Wilson should have devoted himself more carefully to the study of the great Virginian's mighty work in laying the foundations of the modern law of neutrality, of which he seems to have only a hazy notion. When the European nations were, then as now, tearing each other to pieces on land and sea, Jefferson was wise and thrifty enough to perceive that the American clipper ships then decorating our Atlantic seaboard could do a great business, as they did, if an enforceable law of neutrality could be created. Really the greatest of Jefferson's achievements, from a practical point of view, is represented by his part in the creation of the modern law of neutrality, by which the world has been governed from his time down to its recent abolition by the British and German Empires. And yet Jefferson's work, intellectual as it was, would have been a failure had it not been for the stern moral dignity of Washington, who understood that the very essence of neutrality depends upon an unswerving impartiality that refuses to favor one belligerent as against the other. When Jefferson, full of love and partisan feeling for France, showed signs of sympathy for Genet's design to make our shores bases for French expeditions against Great Britain, Washington planted his great foot on the earth and said, No! He refused to play favorites; he refused to make fish of one and flesh of another.

If Mr. Wilson had only been wise enough, and honest enough to learn that great yet simple lesson from the master character, how much higher in the respect of the world should we stand today! I sympathize with him

in his partiality for the Allies. I also have British blood in my veins, but not so much as he has—*one half*. Mr. Wilson constantly forgets, when he expresses distrust of people with foreign blood in their veins, *what a typical hyphenated citizen he himself really is*. If I were in power I know I would be tempted, just as Jefferson was, to do very unlawful things for great and glorious France, never so splendid, so heroic, as now. But all such weakness is unworthy when the duty of neutrality is involved. Mr. Wilson should have refused, as Washington did, to play favorites; he has had no right, legal or moral, to be the secret ally of the Allies, while claiming to be neutral. If I were to yield to my personal feelings I would favor France and Great Britain as against Germany; but I would not favor either at the expense of the neutral commerce of the United States, which Mr. Wilson has shamefully failed to defend. We have been outraged and trampled upon on the high seas by both the German and British Empires without any real satisfaction from either. The mangled bodies of American men, women, and children, one of them of my own family connection, have floated away unavenged from the wreck of the *Lusitania*; the cotton of the South, the food products of the Middle West, the mineral products of the Far West have been unlawfully seized by the British Navy as contraband; the mails have been violated, without any substantial redress. Mr. Wilson does not seem to understand that the primary purpose of our diplomatic system is to obtain *actual redress for wrongs done to our citizens*, and not to put into circulation rhetorical diplomatic literature whose force would be double if its volume were reduced by more than one half. We have had notes, notes, notes, like Amos Cottle's poem, with "lines forty thousand, cantos twenty-five;" but we have had *no actual redress of any practical kind*. To the intolerable wrongs inflicted

on the persons and property of our neutral and unoffending citizens by the British and German Empires, we have only responded with paper bullets bearing the pathetic inscription, "Too proud to fight!"

From the foundation of the Government it has been considered the high duty of the President to appoint to the office of Secretary of State the foremost statesman and diplomatist of the country. Washington was not too proud to lean upon Jefferson; Jefferson upon Madison; Taylor upon Webster; Pierce upon Marcy; Lincoln upon Seward; Grant upon Hamilton Fish; Hayes upon Evarts; Cleveland upon Olney; McKinley upon John Hay; Roosevelt upon Elihu Root. But at the most critical moment in our diplomatic history Mr. Wilson feels that he is omnipotent enough to get along with Mr. Robert Lansing and Colonel Edward Makepeace House! Who can wonder that Mr. Hughes, in arraigning Mr. Wilson, should say: "If we are to have a Secretary of State, we want a man who will stand before the world as a man of learning, of skill, of experience, of power." Mr. Wilson's greatest weakness is his sublime and flamboyant egotism, which deludes him with the fancy that he is strong enough to clear the executive stage of all possible rivals so that he may star alone. He thinks that as the maker of "the King's speech" he should be "the whole show;" he does not believe there is glory enough for all; he thinks that all power and importance should be vested in himself, no matter how much the country may suffer thereby. Thus he presents the pathetic image of a vain and vacillating opportunist struggling in a bog, and refusing to be aided by stronger and more experienced men, because he is unwilling that anybody should share with him the glory of doing things. What would happen if Mr. Wilson should suffer a genuine spasm of patriotic unselfishness, free from all self-seeking, self-glorification of any kind?

THE MEXICAN HORROR.

No American can look upon the Mexican horror without a sense of pain; no Democrat can look upon it without a sense of humiliation, because the grave condition of things existing when President Wilson entered into office has been converted into a prolonged drama of death and destruction by his unprecedented and offensive intermeddling with the internal government of a friendly state, in open defiance of the most elementary principle of international law. As Mr. Wilson took into his own hands the management of this business by the appointment of his special and confidential agent, Mr. John Lind (the President's "personal spokesman and representative" in the regulation of the internal politics of Mexico), he made himself directly and personally responsible for all that has happened since that time. He opened Pandora's Box when he dared to trample upon that elementary principle of the law of nations, which sternly forbids one state to intermeddle in the internal politics of another, by applying that grossly unlawful pressure that resulted in the deposition of the *de facto* President, Huerta, the only man capable of maintaining order, who had been actually recognized by Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Spain, and Japan. It is almost incredible that an American President, claiming to be an upholder of the law of nations, should have dared to intermeddle with the internal politics of Mexico not only by attempting to destroy its *de facto* ruler, recognized as *de jure* by many of the world powers, but by declaring that such ruler would not be permitted to be a candidate for the office of President at the election which Mr. Wilson demanded. As there is no precedent for such flagrant and insulting intermeddling in the internal politics of a friendly state, can we wonder at the Mexican hatred of Americans, which Mr. Wilson's unlawful conduct has so intensified?

After deposing Huerta, President Wilson recognized, in his place and stead, General Carranza, who seems to revel in the destruction of American lives and property, and in the pitiless persecution of the Catholic Church. I have had from the lips of one of the sufferers, a religious born in the South, a description of the conditions that have driven from their convents many nuns who were compelled to put on secular dress and to seek shelter in Catholic homes from outrages, too terrible for words, inflicted upon their associates. I have talked with an exiled Mexican Bishop forced under the Carranza regime into hiding for months in humble abodes in order to save his life. Will Mr. Wilson's blindest partisan contend that any good thing has so far resulted from his unlawful and offensive intermeddling with the internal affairs of this friendly state? When our citizens have appealed to him for protection they have been told to fly for their lives; when they have asked him to obtain indemnity for their losses they have been comforted only by a vague and icy smile.

When the future historian undertakes to reduce to some kind of order Mr. Wilson's bewildering and fantastic performances in Mexico, he will be forced to confess that, in one particular at least, he has been brilliantly consistent—that whenever he has professed to do one thing he has invariably done the opposite. After a correct and ostentatious declaration that the Mexican people have the right to fight it out among themselves; that we have no right to intervene in their internal affairs, he set on foot two armed interventions, both of which have ended in pitifully lame and impotent conclusions. After the publication of a sound state paper setting forth the best of reasons why we should not sell arms and munitions to neighbors, actively engaged in disturbing our peace by cutting their own throats, he reversed himself by

expressly authorizing what he had sternly condemned. On July 10, 1915, a great American newspaper stated the case fairly when it said: "The only Mexican since Díaz able to keep order in Mexico City was Huerta. President Wilson declared a sort of personal war on him, with the armed forces of the United States. Mr. Wilson drove Señor Huerta out of Mexico and is now keeping him out, while permitting the other Mexican revolutionary leaders and plunderers to come and go freely. The export of ammunition to Mexico is permitted, then forbidden, then repermited in spasmodic fits and starts." That "spasmodic fits and starts" policy represents the only contribution actually made by a nervous, fidgety, and irresolute opportunist, who has aggravated a difficult situation, first, by a wanton disregard of an elementary principle of international law; second, by the lack of that kind of consistency and force which a commanding President would have supplied.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND AND PRESIDENT WILSON CONTRASTED.

In the famous Venezuelan case, President Cleveland, backed by his great Secretary of State, Mr. Olney, demonstrated what a President of real moral dignity and authority could accomplish through unbending resolution, even against the greatest of the world powers, at a time when our military and naval unpreparedness was at its height. Diplomacy draws its strength not so much from the man behind the gun as from the man behind the pen, when that man, speaking not as a timid rhetorician but as the real mouthpiece of a great compelling nation like our own, is known to be one who means what he says. Great Britain bowed at the critical time in question to our primacy in the New World, because Lord Salisbury knew that when President Cleveland put that high and inevi-

table construction on the Monroe Doctrine, which Mr. Wilson is industriously striving to undermine, he was ready to maintain it even at the cost of our last dollar and our last man. President Cleveland never said once: "We are too proud to fight."

Since Mr. Wilson has forced an unwilling Congress to crown 95,000,000 of American citizens with a bitter National humiliation through the abject surrender of their sacred rights to the imperious demands of a mere handful, it is impossible not to recall the splendid courage of President Cleveland who, in 1894, with the great Richard Olney at his side as Attorney-General, appealed under like circumstances to the courts, whose final judgment was recorded in the Debs case, in which the Supreme Court of the United States said: "The strong arm of the National Government may be put forth to brush away all obstructions to the freedom of interstate commerce or the transportation of the mails. If the emergency arises, the army of the Nation and all its militia are at the service of the Nation to compel obedience to its laws." With the entire force and authority of the American people at his command, Mr. Wilson preferred to display upon his banner the now familiar device—"Surrender!" Thus on Sunday morning last occurred the most abject moment in the life of this Republic when the chiefs of the four railroad Brotherhoods, *who had frightened and coerced the President of the United States by a threat*, put into his hand the four pens (their trophies of victory) with which he signed, as his act and deed, the fatal admission that the Government of this Nation, *while in his keeping*, had lost the right to think and act as a free agent!

"One hour of Grover Cleveland or Theodore Roosevelt would have settled the question," said Representative Gillett of Massachusetts, "*but President Wilson listened to the voice of expediency and failed in his duty.*"

MR. CLEVELAND'S ESTIMATE OF MR. WILSON.

What a blessing it would be if we could have Mr. Cleveland now! But as we cannot, we must be content to profit by his estimate, very carefully made, of the only Democrat who has occupied the White House since that time. For some years Mr. Cleveland lived at Princeton while Mr. Wilson was at the head of that institution, participating with him in its management. Thus he was able to study the President of Princeton at close range, and to see him from every angle. In the light of such intimate knowledge the great ex-President made a very careful estimate of Mr. Wilson, which he deliberately expressed at Princeton in no vague or uncertain terms. I therefore appeal to every Cleveland democrat to ascertain what that estimate was, and to weigh it well, before he consents to vote for the re-election of a man who solemnly pledged himself neither to seek nor accept a second term. By his bad faith in breaking the solemn "promises and covenants" contained in the platform upon which the people elected him; by his cold-blooded selfishness in building up a personal and political dictatorship upon the ruins of the party that trusted him, Mr. Wilson has fully confirmed all that Mr. Cleveland said of him. It would be a sad commentary on human nature if such an unprecedented line of presidential conduct had not aroused in the minds of the real leaders of the Democratic party, many of whom refused to attend "the cut-and-dried" St. Louis Convention (the ripe fruit of Mr. Wilson's political dictatorship), a sense of indignation and revolt, which is only kept down by a noble spirit of loyalty and self-abnegation that impels them to believe that the future of the party might be injured by the dethroning, at this critical moment, of a leader whom they despise personally and distrust politically.

THE THINGS MR. WILSON STANDS FOR.

As Mr. Wilson was careful to define beforehand in books most of the political theories and vagaries he has put into practice since his elevation to the Presidency, it is very easy to epitomize precisely the things he now stands for. In the first place, he stands for the new and revolting political gospel which teaches that bad faith should be made the basis of American politics by dispensing the President of the United States from the performance of the solemn "promises and covenants" made by him to the people in party platforms; in the second, for the contention that the Presidency is "the true center of the Federal structure, *the real throne of administration*, and the frequent source of policies;" in the third, for the contention that "that high office [the Presidency] has fallen from its first estate of dignity because its power has waned, and its power has waned because the power of Congress has become predominant;" in the fourth, for the contention that the old condition of things should be restored by making the Congress a subordinate and dependent body subject to the direction and control of the Executive; in the fifth, for the contention that "the King's speech" should be reestablished in the place of the Presidential message which the "aristocrat," the "philosophical radical," the "patron of the people," Jefferson, inaugurated; in the sixth, for the contention that the President should not mingle with the uninvited masses of the people at Inaugural Balls and New Year's Day receptions; in the seventh, for the contention that a Democratic President should be, *ex officio*, the political dictator of his party; in the eighth, for a timid and vacillating foreign policy based on the false and humiliating assumption that we are "too proud to fight;" in the ninth, for the most stupendous annual appropriations ever made in the history of the American people. The

words of the Baltimore platform are these: "We denounce the profligate waste of money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people." To that burning denunciation the Republican National Committee has just made this laconic and crushing reply: "The total 'appropriations' of the last Republican Congress (two sessions) amounted to \$2,054,000,000. The appropriations of this Congress (two sessions) will total at least \$3,400,000,000. The increase in the appropriations due to preparedness is \$390,000,000, which leaves an increase of \$200,000,000 of actual appropriations over last session." Is it strange that, in the presence of such a humiliation, Mr. Wilson should have cried out, in his speech of acceptance, just delivered in the summer palace at Shadow Lawn: "Boasting is always an empty business which pleases nobody but the boaster, and I have no disposition to boast of what the Democratic party has accomplished." Mr. Wilson has nothing to boast of but failures which surrounds us on every side, both at home and abroad, so far as his performances are concerned.

Is there any partisan of Mr. Wilson so blind or so uncandid as to deny that he has formally and solemnly committed himself to each of the nine propositions set forth above, either by his printed declarations or by his solemn public acts? If he is re-elected he will attempt, of course, to make such deadly and undemocratic theories the permanent bases of our national life. *What kind of a Democrat, what kind of an American, who believes in government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," can conscientiously*

support a Presidential candidate standing upon a platform composed of those nine propositions, which completely overthrow the famous trilogy which Mr. Lincoln proclaimed as the true basis of our national life. Under such conditions I deem it the duty of every patriotic American, no matter what his past political affiliations may have been, to give his earnest support to the candidacy of the Hon. Charles E. Hughes, a wise and patriotic statesman, whose life has been an open book, and whose character for courage, candor, and faithfulness has never been impugned. At this particular juncture I believe that his views on the tariff should be as attractive to thoughtful Democrats as to Republicans, because the soundest of our economists and financiers believe that, after the end of the present world-war, only the enforcement of such views can save us from a catastrophe. My personal admiration for and confidence in Mr. Hughes as a man add to my pleasure in assuring you that I deem it my duty to give him my humble and cordial support. Use my name as you may see fit in behalf of the candidacy of Mr. Hughes.

HANNIS TAYLOR.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 900 821 2 ●